



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

*Latin Grammar.* By WILLIAM GARDNER HALE and CARL DARLING BUCK.  
Chicago: Atkinson, Metzger & Grover, 1905.

The evolution of our Latin school grammars has been slow, and they all bear upon their pages the impress of two thousand years of tradition. It is no small task to adjust to present conditions (not to speak of reorganizing or reconstructing, a system of presenting the facts of language that has not only become ingrained in the minds of classical scholars, but has even permeated those of the educated public in general. Yet the rise of the historical method of studying language is making itself felt, though but slowly. It is already leaving behind its earlier stage, which by laying undue stress upon the time element produced what may be termed not inappropriately the "chronological" grammar (for example, Draeger's *Syntax*). Students of Latin grammar are coming more and more to approach their subject from the point of view of general linguistics, and are rapidly assimilating the truths revealed by this branch of language study and by comparative philology. The earnest student of Latin in America cannot help but feel great joy at the steady improvements that the last ten or fifteen years have seen in our school grammars, and a certain pardonable pride in their growing individuality and relative independence of foreign models. The authors of the grammar that forms the subject of this review have striven to produce a book that would be recognized by competent authorities as fully abreast of the times, and it is difficult to conceive of the men who wrote the *Oscan-Umbrian Verb-System* and *The Cum-Constructions* as falling far short of their ambitions in this respect. It is unnecessary to enumerate the excellencies of this book. If one adds to its general "up-to-dateness" the many innovations (in nearly all cases improvements) in which the authors are, so to speak, in advance of the times, he will be able to form an approximately fair estimate of its value. To one point in particular the attention of teachers cannot be too frequently directed. The authors are to be most heartily congratulated for having adopted the policy of departing from the traditional nomenclature and traditional methods of presenting facts, where the retention of the old would involve inadequate statements or misunderstanding. Our present deeper insight into the nature of language has taught us the perversity of the older so-called "logical" method of viewing language—a method which has lent a coloring to nearly all our traditional technical terms. To illustrate, it has been the traditional practice in school grammars to bunch together under the category "concessive" a variety of subordinate clauses and independent sentences differing widely in meaning. Although in some of the more recent grammars much improvement was made in the treatment of this group of constructions, yet in the Hale and Buck book they have received more discriminating treatment than ever before. The use of more exact technical terms cannot fail to be helpful to the pupil. He comes to them with an impressionable mind untrammelled by tradition. He has few old and incorrect ideas to revise or forget. It is only upon the teacher that such a book as this makes demands; and no teacher who is broad-minded and ambitious will fail to make every effort to emancipate his mind from a faulty system of presentation which he may have learned in college or university and to which he has become enslaved.

If the right to criticize may be assumed by one who has never written a Latin grammar, and who may therefore be assumed not to be in an ideal position to pass judgment in the matter, the reviewer would venture the suggestion that the authors have not gone far enough in their innovations. I would not so much urge that a larger number of exact technical terms be introduced,<sup>1</sup> that the meanings and uses of the forms be still more carefully and accurately described in plain and simple English, and that the language used should even more perfectly reflect the point of view taken by the more recent investigators of language. Would it not be better to do as many have done, and omit all attempt to give a definition of a sentence, than to employ one which is after all only a slight modification of the old "logical" definition? Is not the statement §221, *e*, "Latin has no article," misleading in the same sense as that other generalization so often met (not, however, in this grammar), "Latin has no word for 'yes' "? Undoubtedly the use of the phrase "dative of agent" is justified, but would it not be better to add to §373 a note of explanation corresponding to note *a* in §371? Again, the vague ideas that cluster about the word "tense" in the minds even of most university students, and consequently of many teachers, would seem to justify a more adequate definition of the word than that given in §465, which appears, at least, to contradict the analysis carried out in §466. Possibly a brief statement of the difference between modality (*Actionsart*) and tense in its traditional sense would not be out of place, even though special forms for expressing *Actionsart* are not so fully developed in Latin as in some other languages. §271, II, *a*, the statement of the meaning of *iste* needs slight modification and the remark about *is* is misleading.

But it is not the purpose of this review to point out what may appear to the writer to be specific excellencies and defects. He would rather earnestly commend the book to the careful study of those secondary teachers who are not already familiar with it. A systematic and detailed comparison of this grammar with any of our better school grammars cannot fail to be a source of much profit to the intelligent teacher, even by virtue of the difference in points of view and aside from any question as to which point of view may enable the author to give the young pupil a more faithful picture of the language. Such a comparison would stimulate the teacher to the exercise of more independent judgment, impress him with the necessity of studying each specific case he meets in the light of its own particular setting (context), and so enable him to bring a less prejudiced mind to the solution of the daily problems of his classroom. We hope that the promised "Appendix" will be issued in the very near future.

C. L. MEADER

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

<sup>1</sup> Because they foster a tendency to mechanical interpretation.